

Mark Weber: Squishy Semi-Revisionist Shirker – Part One

Mark Weber Runs away from the Past

by [Hadding Scott](#)

Published: 2016-02-28

This paper is part of the series [Mark Weber: Squishy Semi-Revisionist Shirker](#). Click below for the previous or next item of the series. Click on 'up' to return to the series' Table of Contents.

Anybody who has not taken a particular interest in Historical Revisionism is likely to find little to criticize in Mark Weber's statements to Jim Rizoli in this interview (see below; we apologize for the poster image; this is Rizoli's style...). Such a viewer will likely be impressed that Weber speaks well of Holocaust Revisionists and defends their right to raise "questions."

If Mark Weber were a professor at a university or a mainstream public figure, that would be a net benefit. The problem is that Mark Weber does not occupy any such position but is the director of the Institute for Historical Review. He is supposed to be a leader in Holocaust Revisionism, not a spectator benevolently defending that movement's free-speech rights.

As an historian and as the director of the Institute, Mark Weber is supposed to be dealing in hard facts and logic and reaching conclusions about history. The motto of the Institute for Historical Review is: "to bring history into accord with the facts," and from its founding in 1978 the Institute was to be focused especially on dissecting and debunking what almost nobody else wanted to touch, that great body of destructive legends known as the Holocaust of the Jews. That was why the Institute

for Historical Review was needed. The Institute was thus always intended to be radical, uncompromising, and at the vanguard of controversy. At one time it was. You will notice however that in this interview, uncompromising conclusions about the Holocaust are something that Mark Weber prefers to avoid.

This was not the case with Mark Weber in the early 1990s. Compare the Mark Weber interviewed by Jim Rizoli in 2016 with the Mark Weber who appeared on [Montel in 1992](#) and you will see a very different man.

It is evident that Mark Weber's reputation is based mainly on what he was doing a quarter-century ago. You can see this, for example, in the video of one of Weber's London Forum appearances, where he is [introduced](#) as a man who "has perhaps done more to bring history into accord with the facts than any other man on this planet." If Weber had taken the opportunity to explain that he now rejects much of his own past work, it would likely have put a damper on his welcome.

Although Jim Rizoli is a very friendly host who is very grateful for the work that Mark Weber used to do, Weber experiences some awkward moments during this interview, because of Rizoli's questioning and because of Weber's inability to answer several of the questions, and even inability to support assertions that he made during this interview.

Of course it is important that Mark Weber now claims to believe that Jews were gassed during the Second World War, while being unable to defend that position intelligently. That fact, if more widely attended, would likely put a dent in Weber's speaking-invitations. Weber's new position on gassing, however, is not an anomaly but part of a pattern of evasiveness. I intend to call attention to Weber's general pattern, throughout this interview, of shirking his special responsibility as a nominal historian and as director of the Institute for Historical Review, a pattern which the casual viewer otherwise might not notice.

The Young Mark Weber

Rizoli begins by asking Weber about how he came to revisionism. Weber indicates that he lived in Germany for a period circa 1970 and while there learned that Germans and Europeans generally had a very

different perspective than Americans in regard to the Second World War:

"That was already a very important thing, to realize that the narrative of history can vary from place to place, regardless of what actually happened. What happened, happened. But how people interpret the past depends on cultural factors, it depends on one's own experiences, point of view, who's controlling the narrative, and so forth." (5:10-5:38)

The message, that discrepancies in accounts of the past are the result of differing perspectives and interpretations and "who's controlling the narrative" (rather than a matter of falsehood that must be corrected), is one that Weber repeats during this interview.

There is a problem, however, when Weber implies that different people were "controlling the narrative" in Europe compared to the United States. The victorious powers of the Second World War certainly imposed their narrative in Europe. If Mark Weber met ordinary Germans who disagreed with that narrative it is because they happened to have contradictory experiences and information. In other words, this was an example of truth being propagated in spite of "who's controlling the narrative."

This is an inconvenient fact for the Mark Weber of 2016, who is supposed to be leading the propagation of such forbidden truth but largely declines the task, alleging the supposed inefficacy of such efforts, so long as the "Jewish-Zionist power" persists, as one of his main excuses.

Weber on Faurisson (7:20-12:42)

Weber now talks about people who influenced him, in particular Robert Faurisson and Ernst Zündel.

"Now later I was very impressed by Robert Faurisson. His work was very important. That opened up even the possibility that this sort of narrative wasn't really accurate."

"I was living in Washington, D.C. and at that time it was through an odd series of coincidence, of, uh, circumstances, that I met Faurisson. And that had a big influence on me.

"Faurisson has of course, as we know, done very, very important, path-breaking work. He raised a lot of questions that needed to be raised, and ... discovered some very important documents, some very important things, that no one else had really even bothered to look up.

"This was very exciting, just intellectually, for me. By that time, that I met Faurisson, I had already gone into college; I had gotten a master's degree in history, and I began doing [research] into aspects of this whole question that we call the Holocaust." (7:20-8:30)

You cannot tell from what Mark Weber says in 2016 that Robert Faurisson ever proved anything. He credits Faurisson with discovering some documents and opening up a "possibility" and raising "questions," but does not even say that Faurisson arrived at any conclusions. Neither does Weber say that he was convinced; rather that he found Faurisson's work "very exciting, just intellectually." The Holocaust itself, in this context, Weber calls not a lie or a myth but a "question."

In 2016 for the director of the IHR to call the Holocaust a "question," and thus to avoid taking a position based on all that has been learned, is inexcusable.

Rizoli is puzzled at Weber's claim that he met Faurisson at the airport in Washington, D.C., "through an odd series of coincidence, of, uh, circumstances" and demands explanation. Weber, forced to explain, says that his contact with Faurisson came about because he had already known another prominent revisionist, Arthur Butz.

"[Faurisson] was coming to Washington, D.C. to do some research. And I had just coincidentally [shakes head], some years earlier, met Arthur Butz. It wasn't because of the Holocaust matter." (9:01-9:15)

Weber nervously shakes his head several times especially while uttering the latter sentence, giving the impression of trying to hide something. He claims that Butz put him in touch with Faurisson not

because of any shared interest in revisionism but merely "to sort of show him around."

Weber wants to make sure that everyone understands that he was not interested in Holocaust Revisionism when he met Faurisson in 1979, nor before then.

But then, evidently anticipating that he will have to explain how he came to join the IHR, he explains that he had coincidentally met David McCalden, the Institute's founder, several years earlier in Europe:

"I mean, another coincidence [shaking his head] was that I came in touch with the Institute for Historical Review, because I had known before he came to the United States the person who was actually the founder of the IHR, was David McCalden. I had actually met him in England before, in London." (11:37-11:53)

This is too many coincidences. In the cases of Butz and McCalden, Weber lets us know that these meetings were not really *coincidences* by shaking his head as he utters the word.

It means that Weber was not telling the truth when he said that it was Faurisson who opened up for him the "possibility" that the Holocaust "narrative wasn't really accurate," since Weber was already acquainted with Arthur Butz and David McCalden. This is obviously why Mark Weber wanted to meet Robert Faurisson when the latter happened to come to the United States to attend the first conference of the IHR in September 1979.

Weber also avoids mentioning that when he met Faurisson, he was a member of William Pierce's National Alliance (based at that time in Washington), and editor of the organization's publication, *National Vanguard*. It is most likely not the association with William Pierce *per se*, but rather the views on history that Weber put into writing at the time, that Weber is especially keen on hiding (since experience shows that criticizing or opposing Jews in a general way is not nearly as dangerous as disputing the Holocaust). Weber's first published revisionist writings appeared in *National Vanguard*.

When he wrote for *National Vanguard* in 1979 Weber did not restrict himself to saying what he says today, that Faurisson merely opened a "possibility" and posed "questions." About Faurisson Weber wrote this:

"In a number of recently published articles, he conclusively exposes the entire 'gas chamber' fraud. Writing in the prestigious Paris daily Le Monde, Prof. Faurisson notes, for example, that despite thousands of detailed documents on the crematoria built to dispose of the bodies of typhus epidemic victims, not a single piece of documentary evidence has ever been produced to substantiate the existence of even one gas chamber: not an order for construction, a plan, an invoice, or a photograph. During the hundreds of 'war crimes' trials, nothing could be produced.

"Furthermore, Faurisson notes that almost all the original gas chamber claims have been quietly abandoned during the last 30 years. Several years after the war, a number of concentration camp officials were put on trial and 'confessed' (under brutal torture) to the existence of gas chambers at Ravensbrück (Germany), Mauthausen (Austria), and Natzweiler (Alsace). Today, Faurisson points out, the only gas chambers which Jewish writers still claim existed are those which were located in Communist-ruled Poland. And those claims rest essentially upon discredited 'affidavits' and 'memoirs' extracted from Germans since executed, and not upon substantive evidence." [Mark Weber, "Holocaust Claims Exposed as Lies", *National Vanguard* No. 69, 1979]

The Mark Weber of 1979 seems to have had no qualms about noting the lack of "substantive evidence" for the claim that any Jew was gassed, and did not shrink from concluding that the gas-chamber story was invalidated by this lack of evidence. Faurisson "conclusively exposes the entire gas-chamber fraud," according to the Mark Weber of 1979.

What a contrast to the Mark Weber of 2016! To make his current agnostic attitude toward Faurisson's findings seem less absurd, Weber tries to minimize his own record in disputing the Holocaust and to explain away his association with others who did the same.

In an attempt to compensate for this dereliction of duty as director of the IHR, Weber poses as a champion of free speech and laments the hysterical *ad hominem* reaction to Faurisson's findings. He also claims to have acted as a publicist of Faurisson's work, which he seems to regard in 2016 not as a clear discovery of fact that would require rewriting of history-books, but as an intellectual oddity that "deserved a hearing, deserved to be better understood and known." In this 2016 interview, the closest that Weber comes to saying that Faurisson was right is when he says that the nature of the attacks on him would make one "suspicious" about who was right and who was wrong. (10:37-11:26)

Mark Weber on Ernst Zündel (14:33-37:30)

By 1988, Mark Weber had been an employee of the Institute for Historical Review for several years, when he received a phone-call from Ernst Zündel, who was being prosecuted in Canada for republishing *Did Six Million Really Die?*, a booklet (originally published in England in 1974) that disputes the mainstream account of what happened to Jews during the Second World War.

Weber says that he was suspicious of Zündel at first because he seemed to be "a very colorful, kind of reckless kind of guy," but he gives credit to Zündel's organizational ability. "Zündel had a tremendous ability to size up people and to get them to work together with each other, and with him..."

Weber omits to mention here that he *had corresponded and been in contact by telephone for some years* with Zündel prior to 1988 (B. Kulaszka, *Did Six Million Really Die?*, p. 420).

Since the mediaeval English law under which Zündel was being prosecuted was a prohibition against spreading "false news," Zündel was seeking expert witnesses who would testify that the content of *Did Six Million Really Die?* was not false.

In 1979 Mark Weber had described *Did Six Million Really Die?* as "a convincing 28-page booklet," and the Mark Weber of 1988 still had sufficient convictions along those lines to be a useful witness for Ernst

Zündel's defense. Weber was qualified as an expert witness and ended up being on the witness-stand for five days.

It is questionable, however, whether the Mark Weber of 2016 would be of any value at all.

In 2016 Weber minimizes the truth-value of *Did Six Million Really Die?* and says that Zündel did not publish it as fact but only as opinion:

"He was not offering this booklet and didn't print this booklet as a final, definitive word on any subject. He was offering this book because he felt, it's important that people hear this point of view. This is an opinion." (27:12-27:28)

Regarding the accuracy of *DSMRD*, the most that Weber is willing to say, when Rizoli asks him about his testimony, is that the book "makes a lot of very good points," then, pausing, perhaps realizing that he had just said too much, Weber affords himself an escape from having to defend any particular point in *DSMRD* by adding, "and of course some very good questions." (27:02-27:08)

It is certain that when Ernst Zündel published *Did Six Million Really Die?*, he was much more earnest about what he was doing than Weber now wants to acknowledge. The words on the cover of the booklet – "Historical Fact No. 1" and "Truth at last EXPOSED:" – indicate that the content was intended precisely as a presentation of fact, not mere opinion. Ernst Zündel certainly believed that he was publishing a work of fact and truth.

For the most part, the book was vindicated by the testimonies given in court. But it was a source of great embarrassment for Zündel that a few errors were found. When the False News Trials were over, Zündel published a new edition with the errors corrected and the disputed points noted. (The original, British publisher also issued a corrected edition.)

Weber does not show any regard for the purpose of Zündel's effort, which was to exonerate the Germans of the Holocaust-libel. The

documentary about Zündel, *Off Your Knees, Germany!* is described as "a summary of Ernst Zündel's political outreach and struggling to restore the honor of his German people." This is what Zündel was trying to accomplish, but you would not know it from listening to Mark Weber. (The fact that Weber does not share this agenda of rescuing the German people from defamation and humiliation becomes clearer as the interview progresses.)

As in his account of Robert Faurisson, Weber avoids saying that Ernst Zündel was right about anything in the realm of historical fact, or that he challenged any important historical claims, but takes the safe position of lamenting transgressions against Zündel's freedom of speech:

"Whatever anybody thinks about Ernst Zündel, what he did was increase and defend the rights of all Canadians, by getting rid of this unjust and even unconstitutional law. But Zündel of course doesn't get much thanks from most people for this great service to Canadians." (23:55-24:18)

One of the problems with such a statement is that many people will not appreciate the right to say something that is false. Regardless of whatever abstract ideal of freedom people may formally espouse, freedom of speech is granted to liars only grudgingly at best. Only the free speech of those who demonstrate that they are telling the truth is really valued. Therefore the fact that what Zündel had published was found in court to be essentially true is very important, even for the purpose of securing the right to say it.

For an American, advocating freedom of speech is *de rigueur*, and no great act of heroism on Weber's part. Furthermore, as an historian, Mark Weber should be concerned with facts. How can Weber justify in his own mind that when he recounts the history of the False News Trials, he refrains from mentioning that according to the testimony submitted during the trials, the content of *Did Six Million Really Die?* was found to be essentially correct? For any historian, and especially for the director of the IHR, this should be the most important fact.

It is thus with some irony that Mark Weber criticizes others for giving too little credit to Ernst Zündel, while he himself damns Zündel with faint praise.

End of PART ONE.

Mark Weber: Squishy Semi-Revisionist Shirker – Part Two

Weber's Attempts to Justify Abandoning Holocaust Revisionism

by [Hadding Scott](#)

Published: 2016-03-08

This paper is part of the series [Mark Weber: Squishy Semi-Revisionist Shirker](#). Click below for the previous or next item of the series. Click on 'up' to return to the series' Table of Contents.

In the [first part](#), I showed that Mark Weber, in his [interview with Jim Rizoli \(10 February 2016\)](#), consistently tried to avoid acknowledging any findings of Holocaust Revisionism, and also tried to conceal his past acknowledgment of such findings. In this part, the focus is on Weber's attempts to justify his retreat from Holocaust Revisionism.

Mark Weber gives several arguments to justify his current refusal to support the revisionist findings that he once supported in regard to the Holocaust. I was able to discern the following, somewhat contradictory arguments, listed here in ascending order of absurdity:

1. The question of whether the Holocaust-story is true or false is no longer relevant.
2. Although the truth about the Holocaust is relevant (contradicting the previous point) it should not be relevant!
3. There is no point in disputing the Holocaust because Jews really were gassed!

Mark Weber Claims that the Holocaust is Irrelevant (37:30-51:35 *et passim*)

This is a position that Mark Weber publicly declared with an essay, "How Relevant is Holocaust Revisionism?" that appeared in January 2009. He claims that the Holocaust is no longer relevant because it was so long ago. Young people, he says, are no longer interested in it. Weber proposes to attack what he calls "the Jewish-Zionist power" through some avenue other than Holocaust Revisionism.

Weber, however, notably does not avoid discussing decades-old history in general, only the Holocaust. You will find much work by Mark Weber about the Second World War and National-Socialist Germany online that was done after he proclaimed the irrelevance of Holocaust Revisionism (e.g. his *Worldwatch* podcasts for Voice of Reason). The rationale that Weber gives for not discussing the Holocaust -- that nobody is interested anymore because it was so long ago -- is patent bunk.

Even if there had been a decline of interest in the Holocaust, it would not be a reason for the director of the IHR to *avoid* the subject as Mark Weber clearly does. In fact, the director of the IHR does not have the right to avoid Holocaust Revisionism, because it is the reason why the IHR was established.

For some, the Holocaust itself is still very relevant. Tell the nonagenarian former camp-guards recently put on trial in Germany that the Holocaust is no longer relevant.

More important than the Holocaust itself, however, are the so-called "lessons of the Holocaust," which are very influential, and affect not only nonagenarian Germans but the entire world.

Weber opines that the Jewish-Zionist power is waning (39:32-39:44). Even if this is true, the false "lessons of the Holocaust" that this power has established as dogma must still be combatted because of their destructive effect. Why wait for that Jewish-Zionist power to disappear before challenging its "lessons"?

Today we are seeing what may be the death of Europe, and it is clear that the "lessons of the Holocaust" have much to do with it. In the United States, Donald Trump, as a nationalist politician like [Enoch](#)

Powell before him, is targeted with invidious comparisons to Adolf Hitler because he wants to curb some forms of immigration. All of this propaganda derives its force fundamentally from belief in the Holocaust.

Comparisons to Adolf Hitler and references to the Holocaust have also been used to motivate unnecessary wars. Weber says that "the Jewish-Zionist power" causes these wars (1:23:31-1:24:05), but Weber is playing a word-game when he says this. The Holocaust is the tool that they use. Labeling some foreign leader as "another Adolf Hitler" and, if necessary, presenting spurious evidence of "another Holocaust" has become the standard method of generating moral pressure to go to war. Think especially of Slobodan Milosevic, Saddam Hussein, and the war against Bashar al-Assad's government that would have happened in 2013 if Vladimir Putin had not interfered.

The fact that the Holocaust is a cherished myth of the "Jewish-Zionist power" that Weber claims to want to attack is already a reason to dispute it (given that the falsity of the Holocaust story is easily shown). It is a way to expose that "Jewish-Zionist power" as dishonest or delusional.

If the Holocaust were no longer relevant, then Mark Weber should have a relaxed attitude toward the subject, instead of carefully avoiding saying that Robert Faurisson and Ernst Zündel were ever right about anything -- as if such an affirmation would have amounted to stepping on a landmine. Mark Weber certainly knows that the Holocaust is still relevant.

In response to Weber's belittlement of Holocaust Revisionism, Rizoli asks Weber:

"What should we be doing then, now? What should we be attacking? ... Are we wasting our time talking about the Holocaust, with all those aspects of it, or should we just go off in another direction on another part of the Jews?" (1:21:34-1:22:09)

What Rizoli clearly means is: what should we be saying, in lieu of disputing the Holocaust?

Thereupon, Weber delays with a flood of verbiage that dims the memory of Rizoli's question, finally telling Rizoli that since he has a capacity for making videos, he should do that -- which obviously does not answer the question as Rizoli intended it.

While trying to maintain that the Holocaust is irrelevant, Weber nonetheless directly admits that it is relevant: "It's also a source of power in that it's referred to, to justify what Israel is doing, of course."

If, as Weber says, mass-media are compelling the public to think about the Holocaust, the most feasible way to oppose that propaganda is not to try to resist thinking about it, but rather, in a judo-like maneuver, to use the enemy's own power against them by thinking about the Holocaust more than they want anyone to think about it -- thinking it through to the point of destroying it. Trying not to think about the Holocaust is no answer when Jewish influence through mass-media is so great. Every presentation of Holocaust-propaganda, however, is also an occasion to challenge that propaganda with compelling facts and logic.

Although the Holocaust is relevant, it should not be relevant (1:19:30-1:21:28)

Weber asserts that giving indulgence to people who claim to have been victimized is stupid.

"And I think it's childish and stupid to take the view that, well if Hitler killed six million Jews, that means we should all be friends of Israel or like Netanyahu, but if he killed 100 thousand Jews then it's okay to say Netanyahu's the bad guy. That's just ridiculous. I mean Israel's policies, or the policies and actions of the Anti-Defamation League or the World Jewish Congress, should be evaluated in and of itself, regardless of how many Jews died or were killed during the Second World War. The whole notion implicit in this victimization narrative of our society, that people are somehow morally better if they've been victimized, is a stupid one."

Weber understands, when he says that it is "childish and stupid" to be "friends of Israel" because of the Holocaust, that this is in fact what happens. He is saying that people should not react the way they do react. He is saying that people should be other than how they are.

Some individuals may find this kind of exhortation to pitilessness appealing, but among people of European descent in general this does not seem a very auspicious approach. Surely it is easier to show people that a story is false than to coax them (using what?) to act contrary to their character and upbringing.

Mark Weber claims to believe that Jews were Gassed (51:36-1:18:23)

During the 1990s Mark Weber developed the habit of telling interviewers, "We don't deny" the Holocaust. What Weber meant by that however was unclear. He had copied the phrase from Professor Robert Faurisson, who meant that as a revisionist scholar he does not *merely* deny, but affirms based on evidence that there was no Holocaust. It was not clear however what Weber meant when uttering the same words. Was Weber conceding that the Holocaust was fact?

In 1995 Weber became director of the Institute for Historical Review. In December 2003 when Faurisson asked the director to clarify his position on the legend of "Nazi gas-chambers," Weber gave this response:

"I do not like to say that 'the Nazi gas chambers never existed,' in part because I do not regard myself as any kind of specialist of 'gas chambers,' and in part because I avoid making such categorical statements (on any subject)."

It was after this evasive response from Director Weber that Faurisson resigned from the IHR. ([R. Faurisson, "Mark Weber Must Resign"](#))

In 2016, however, when Jim Rizoli asks Weber whether he believes that Jews were gassed, Rizoli gets the clear answer that Faurisson never got. Weber says:

"My view about the gas-chambers or gassings is the same essentially as David Irving. And I believe that Jews were gassed. Yes." (52:06-52:18)

More specifically, Weber says:

"My belief, based upon my best assessment [shakes his head] of the evidence, is that large numbers of Jews were killed at Sobibor, Belzec, and Treblinka, most likely by gassing." (54:40-54:55)

After that he repeats that his position is the same as David Irving's (55:09-55:12).

This alignment with David Irving seems to be an important point for Weber. It is significant that Weber does not say that David Irving's position is the same as his, rather the reverse. It is Irving who has influenced Weber.

Weber says that "the balance of evidence" supports his (and Irving's) conclusion. But the evidence that Weber cites to Rizoli is really no evidence at all.

First, it should be noted that Mark Weber realizes that all alleged documents that are supposed to prove claims related to the Holocaust have a cloud of doubt around them, because many have been proven false. Weber gives an example of this when he tells Rizoli that the number of Jewish deaths claimed in the reports of the *Einsatzgruppen* is certainly false: "It's certainly not as large as the reports themselves, issued between 1941 and 1943, might indicate" (1:16:49-1:16:57).

Nonetheless, in this interview Weber refers to an alleged document as proof of the Holocaust: specifically a passage in the so-called Goebbels Diaries,

Weber had testified to the inauthenticity of the so-called Goebbels Diaries in 1988, as follows (quoted by [R. Faurisson](#), "[Mark Weber Must Resign](#)"):

"The later entry, which I think is the 27th of March [1942], is widely quoted to uphold or support the extermination thesis. It is not consistent with entries in the diary like this one of March 7th, and it is not consistent with entries at a later date from the Goebbels diaries, and it is not consistent with German documents from a later date.

"[...] there is a great doubt about the authenticity of the entire Goebbels diaries because they are written on typewriter. We have no real way of verifying if they are accurate, and the U.S. Government certified, in the beginning of the publication, [...] that it can take no responsibility for the accuracy of the diaries as a whole.

"[...] I think again it is worth mentioning that the passage of the 27th of March is inconsistent with the passage of the 7th of March and the one from April, and I don't remember the date exact (Transcript, p. 5820-5821)."

"Goebbels had no responsibility for Jewish policy. He wasn't involved in that. He was the Propaganda Minister. He was involved only to the extent that there were Jews in Berlin and he was responsible for Berlin (p. 5822-5823)."

Weber's testimony about contradictions in the Goebbels Diaries, and his observation that Goebbels (even if he had written those things) was not in a position to know about secret gassings of Jews, is now supposed to be negated by David Irving's discovery in Soviet state archives (euphemistically called "Russian archives" by the Mark Weber of 2016) of photographic plates that include previously published and some unpublished sections of the supposed Goebbels Diaries. (56:02-57:57)

But it is not apparent how David Irving's discovery of old photographic plates would eliminate the contradictions that Mark Weber has noted in the sections already published. It cannot.

It also does not put Goebbels in a better position to know about secret gassings. (Recall that it has been David Irving's position since the late 1970s that Hitler himself had no knowledge of such doings. Especially in that light, the claim that Goebbels did have such knowledge is astounding.)

When Rizoli makes the point that photographic images of alleged diary-pages are unverifiable as to authorship, and that the Soviet government is untrustworthy as a source, Weber responds as follows:

"The glass plates are a kind of primitive form of microfilm, but we also have the papers from which the glass plates were made. That's what's important. If that was the only evidence, that would be one thing, but these plates, the finding of these plates, is a confirmation of what was already known from other archives." (59:10-59:36)

The "papers" to which Weber refers are typed pages that have been in the United States since 1947. They are currently held by the Hoover Institution in California. Weber was already aware of those typed pages when he gave his testimony against their authenticity in 1988.

In fact, all "Goebbels diaries" dated later than July 1941 are typewritten. This means that all alleged pages from alleged Goebbels diaries that could be adduced as contemporary evidence for the Holocaust, including the ones that Weber now adduces, are typewritten, and thus absolutely unverifiable as to authorship.

David Irving pretends, in a speech that he gave at an IHR conference in 1994, that the discovery in Soviet state archives of photographic plates that include images of the typed pages held by the Hoover Institution somehow proves that those pages come from an authentic Goebbels Diary. (quoted by [Mark Weber](#), "[Faurisson's Unfair Rebuke](#)", [21 April 2009](#))

It proves no such thing. It proves only that the typed pages were in Soviet possession before they came into American possession. This in no way vouches for their authenticity: rather the opposite.

Weber merely copies David Irving in espousing this pretended proof. The argument is a *non sequitur* that can be accepted as valid only by

somebody too confused, or too overawed with David Irving's manner, to take it apart. It means that David Irving knew that he was pulling a fast one when he started making this argument for the authenticity of the Goebbels Diaries in the 1990s, and that Mark Weber too, unless there is an affliction to his brain that he did not suffer 25 years ago, must also know that he is pulling a fast one by repeating what Irving says.

Another argument that Weber offers in support of the Holocaust is that there could have been gassings in the Aktion Reinhardt camps because there are no structural remains in those places that could be used to produce the kind of debunking represented by a *Leuchter Report* or *Rudolf-Gutachten*. "There's nothing really to investigate at Belzec, Sobibor, and Treblinka because the camps have been razed," says Weber (1:04:25-1:04:31).

Weber thus pretends that there is no way to attack the accusations relating to those camps, and that they must therefore be accepted as true. Note that Weber gives the benefit of the doubt to the accusers rather than the accused, and, beyond this, ignores the general damage to the credibility of such stories that revisionists have already inflicted.

In the absence of physical evidence, it is still possible to criticize the specific claims about how gassings are supposed to have occurred in those places. Rizoli points out that gassings in the Reinhardt camps, according to so-called witnesses, were done with diesel-exhaust, which is not practical. Weber says that he knows it. When Rizoli then asks Weber how he thinks Jews were killed in those camps, Weber says:

"I don't know." (52:54-53:59)

Weber thus supports an accusation of mass-murder by gas that is utterly void of details, even the detail of what kind of gas is supposed to have been used.

Rizoli asks Weber how many Jews he thinks died in the Holocaust (1:06:30-1:10:24). Weber embarks on a lengthy digression (echoing Faurisson) about the distinction between "Jews who died" and "Jews who were killed" -- which turns out to be pointless, because Weber ultimately makes no such distinction. This digression seems to be a

delaying tactic and an attempt to sound at least a little bit like a Holocaust Revisionist toward an interviewer who has been probing him about his hypocrisy. Finally, Weber's embarrassing response is:

"The number of Jews who died is probably between two and four million." (1:08:30-1:08:41)

Rizoli objects that if Weber claims that 4 million might have died, then he must think that a much larger number of Jews lived in the German sphere of influence, since so many Jews survived. Weber then admits that the number of Jews in German-dominated Europe was "probably not even four million," which is inconsistent with what he had just said.

It is clear that Weber's assertion, that 2-4 million Jews "died," and that some were gassed, is gratuitous, since he cannot even say how that gassing is supposed to have occurred, and when he states the supposed number of Jewish dead, a contradiction results.

Whereas in 2003 Weber told Robert Faurisson that he did "not like to say" that the Nazi gas chambers never existed, it becomes clear in 2016 that Mark Weber -- despite the repeated declarations of his own superior disinterestedness and objectivity -- *does* like to say that the Nazi gas chambers *did* exist. Furthermore, Weber *likes* to state a number of Jewish deaths that, like Gerald Reitlinger's 1953 estimate of 4.2-4.7 million, deviates only moderately from the mythical six million and does not constitute a rejection of the Holocaust as such.

Mark Weber is a Follower, not a Leader

Mark Weber has copied his current general position on the Holocaust from David Irving. Both, the reliance on a "Goebbels Diaries" that Weber himself once denounced, and the eager acceptance of the claim that Jews were *somehow* gassed in those camps where little physical evidence can be adduced, were copied from David Irving.

David Irving's retreat from general skepticism about the Holocaust during the 1990s makes sense in terms of Irving's economic motives,

since, as a formerly celebrated author, when he embraced the *Leuchter Report* and gave testimony for Ernst Zündel in 1988, Irving suddenly had difficulty getting major publishers to accept his work. Irving was a latecomer to Holocaust Revisionism and bailed out of it to the extent that he could when he saw what it cost him.

The IHR, however, was created to go against the grain. The director of the IHR (in theory, at least) does not have the same motives as a commercial author like David Irving, and should not be following David Irving as a role-model, nor invoking his name as a defense.

Today Irving and Weber together, along with "Jewish Revisionist" David Cole, assert that there were gassings in the Aktion Reinhardt camps. While it is to be expected that a commercial author and a Jew would find it convenient to retreat from the full controversy of revisionist findings, Mark Weber, as director of the Institute for Historical Review, is the one who absolutely should not be doing this. If Mark Weber is in his essential character a follower rather than a leader, and feels that he must retreat from this controversy, then he is unfit for the position that he occupies and ought simply to resign.